

1 RONALD P. OINES (SBN 145016)  
roines@rutan.com  
2 RUTAN & TUCKER, LLP  
611 Anton Boulevard, 14th Floor  
3 Costa Mesa, CA 92626-1931  
Telephone: (714) 641-5100  
4 Facsimile: (714) 546-9035

5 RANDOLPH C. FOSTER (OSB 784340)  
rcfooster@stoel.com  
6 (*pro hac vice*)  
STEVEN E. KLEIN (OSB 051165)  
7 seklein@stoel.com  
8 (*pro hac vice*)  
STOEL RIVES LLP  
9 900 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 2600  
Portland, OR 97204  
Telephone: (503) 224-3380  
10 Facsimile: (503) 220-2480

11 EDWARD C. DUCKERS (SBN# 242113)  
edduckers@stoel.com  
12 STOEL RIVES LLP  
555 Montgomery Street, #1288  
13 San Francisco, CA 94111  
Telephone: (415) 617-8900  
14 Facsimile: (415) 617-8907

15 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
JIPC Management, Inc.  
16  
17

18 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
19 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

20 JIPC MANAGEMENT, INC.,

21 Plaintiff,

22 v.

23 INCREDIBLE PIZZA CO., INC.;  
24 INCREDIBLE PIZZA FRANCHISE  
GROUP, LLC; CJM RACING, LLC,

25 Defendants.  
26  
27  
28

Case No. CV08-4310 MMM (PLAx)

**PLAINTIFF'S OPPOSITION TO  
DEFENDANTS' MOTION IN  
LIMINE NO. 5 RE: ALLEGED  
HARM OR DAMAGES PRIOR  
TO PLAINTIFF'S CLAIMS**

**Hon. Margaret M. Morrow**

**Date: July 13, 2009**

**Time: 9:00 a.m.**

**Ctrm: Roybal 780**

1 Plaintiff JIPC Management, Inc. (“JIPC”) submits this Opposition to  
2 Defendants’ Motion in Limine No. 5 (“MIL No. 5”) Re: Alleged Harm or  
3 Damages Prior to Plaintiff’s Claims.

4 **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

5 In this motion, Defendants seeks an order precluding Plaintiff from offering  
6 any evidence to the effect that it suffered any harm or damages as a result of any  
7 action taken or services offered by Defendant prior to the events that gave rise to  
8 this lawsuit. Depending on what evidence is offered by Defendants, it is Plaintiff’s  
9 current intention to seek only damages and injunctive relief related to Defendants’  
10 activities directed to California and adjoining states. (*See* Order Granting in Part  
11 and Denying in Part Defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgment, Doc. 188, at 27  
12 (“a reasonable jury could infer that as of the date the complaint was filed, JIPC’s  
13 market penetration extended to the states surrounding California”). It is also  
14 Plaintiff’s current intention to seek damages only from March 1, 2008 through  
15 trial.<sup>1</sup>

16 What Defendants are really after is a bar against offering the undisputed  
17 evidence that Rick Barsness intentionally adopted a mark and name virtually  
18 identical to Plaintiff’s and that he knew that name would likely cause confusion and  
19 harm to Plaintiff should the businesses operate in the same or proximate geographic  
20 markets. Defendants argue that Mr. Barsness’s intentions and knowledge prior to  
21 his decision to enter into business activities geographically proximate to Plaintiff  
22 are irrelevant. Mr. Barsness’s conduct in adopting and using the marks “[ \_\_\_\_\_ ]  
23 Incredible Pizza Company” for a restaurant concept virtually identical to those  
24 marked “John’s Incredible Pizza Company” is highly relevant and admissible.

25 \_\_\_\_\_  
26 <sup>1</sup> Defendants assert that Plaintiff should be precluded from seeking damages  
27 prior to April 1, 2008, the day after Defendants entered into a formal sponsorship  
28 agreement with CJM Racing. However, the undisputed record demonstrates that  
prior to entering a formal agreement, Defendants sponsored CJM in four races that  
occurred in March 2008 and were broadcast nationwide, including a March 1, 2008  
race held at Las Vegas Motor Speedway.

1           The fact that damages may be limited proximately and temporally does not  
2 mean that evidence going to liability should be so limited. In the Ninth Circuit, a  
3 defendant's knowing adoption of a mark similar to the plaintiff's raises a  
4 presumption of confusion. *AMF Inc. v. Sleekcraft Boats*, 599 F.2d 341, 348 (9th  
5 Cir. 1979). If Defendants' position is adopted, people like Mr. Barsness will have  
6 license to adopt others' trademarks, use them in regions of the country for a short  
7 time, and then enter into the senior user's geographic territories and avoid the legal  
8 presumptions associated with intentional adoption of an identical or similar mark.

9           Defendants' motion should be denied.

10  
11 DATED: June 29, 2009

STOEL RIVES LLP

12 By: /s/Steven E. Klein

13 RANDOLPH C. FOSTER

14 EDWARD C. DUCKERS

STEVEN E. KLEIN

15 RUTAN & TUCKER, LLP

16 RONALD P. OINES

17 Attorneys for Plaintiff

18 JIPC Management, Inc.